

Responses to “On Track if ...”

September 24, 2013

On track if...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biggest impact/relevant • Easy to measure, well defined • Assigned with other work, not duplicating or replacing, supplementary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a measure of state investment in economic development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Achievable in legislative process 2) Solve a significant public policy problem 3) Make sense to public and stakeholder groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are quantifiable, measurable • Are easy to understand • Can be tracked without undue administrative burden
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are easily understood, concise
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use 3rd party validated measure for specific program outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use existing data for high level measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize the difference between short, medium and long-term results and value them appropriately
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify and define economic development • Make sense to people who don't know or care much about economic development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define economic development and separate it from other investments in quality of life or other areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define state investments in economic development • Narrow the focus to measure state investment vs. return and not other definitions of economic development • Metrics based on return on investment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great meeting structure and effort to stay focused on the task(s).
<p>Metrics Subgroup:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flow of the exercise did not lead to a clear conclusion • We may not have had the right mix of interests in the group. We need help interpreting our sub-groups outcomes as defined in the legislative proviso
<p>Roles & Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single mindedness of participants in the breakout session
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liked: Reports from each of the groups was helpful. To see the process coming together and

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> interconnections being made was appreciated Change: Get the agenda out earlier
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plus: More group breakout time Minus: Goals more specifically outlined and focused on
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitator of metrics was helpful in keeping group on track Roger's introduction on methods of discussion and collecting data ended up being quite helpful.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roles & responsibilities (org.) went well – very good Smaller groups change? Nothing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep – generous time for work groups Stop – New seating without worktables Start – Group seating with tables for writing & making notes)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good. Loved the video!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve: No legislative representation in our group today
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Went well: Roger's management of content and time No criticism of meeting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plus: Great introduction and meeting plan Minus: Meeting plan not shared with facilitators in advance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If we're serious about WEDC "change management," need a clean sheet sector/focus example while leveraging the good in the status quo.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plus: Variety of participants, depth of knowledge Minus: Location